

**REMARKS**

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1, 24, and 49 have been amended.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1-10, 24-33, 49-52, 65, 67-73, 75-77, 78-80, and 82-88 stand rejected as being obvious in view of Amin (7,171,221), Shaffer (6,477,374) and Uchiyama (6,987,988).

Claims 1, 24, and 49, as amended, recite that the first phone uses a first wireless communication protocol to answer and place calls on the first phone and the first phone uses a second wireless communication protocols to answer and place calls when the first phone is being used as the cordless handset for the second phone. For example, the first wireless communication protocol may be configured to communicate with a cellular telephone network, as described in paragraph 25 on page 10 of the application as originally filed. As another example, the second wireless communication protocol may be configured to communicate with a wireless personal area network, as described in paragraph 11 on page 8 of the application as originally filed.

The Examiner acknowledges that Amin and Shaffer do not teach or suggest using the first phone as a cordless handset for the second phone, but takes the position that Uchiyama does so teach. Uchiyama teaches a cellular

telephone, a cordless telephone, and a base unit. The cellular telephone can be docked with the base unit. While the cellular phone is docked with the base unit, the cordless handset, which is wirelessly coupled to the base unit, can be used to receive calls to the cellular phone. The cordless handset can also be used to receive calls made to a land line coupled to the base unit.

However, the cordless handset only uses one wireless communication protocol, because the cordless handset only communicates with the base unit. The cellular telephone only uses one wireless communication protocol, because the cellular phone communicates wirelessly with the cellular network and through a direct electrical coupling to the base unit.

Thus, Uchiyama does not teach or suggest wherein the first phone uses a first wireless communication protocol to answer and place calls on the first phone and the first phone uses a second wireless communication protocol to answer and place calls when the first phone is being used as the cordless handset for the second phone as claimed in the amended claims 1, 24, and 49. Since the combination fails to teach the amended claims, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections.

**SUMMARY**

Applicant respectfully submits that in view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the pending claims are in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner determines that the prompt allowance of these claims can be expedited by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Joe Sosinski at (408) 720-8300.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR, & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: November 4, 2009

/Joseph W. Sosinski/  
Joseph W. Sosinski  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 62,807

1279 Oakmead Parkway  
Sunnyvale, CA 94085-4040